



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/413,785	10/07/1999	STAVROS C. MANOLAGAS	D6156	2424

7590 04/03/2002  
SHERRY M. KNOWLES, ESQ  
KNG & SPALDING  
191 PEACHTREE STREET  
ATLANTA, GA 30303-1763

EXAMINER

BAKER, ANNE MARIE


ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1632

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2002

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/413,785</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Manolagas et al.</b>	
	Examiner <b>Anne-Marie Baker, Ph.D.</b>	Group Art Unit <b>1632</b>	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne-Marie Baker, Ph.D. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Stephanie Adams (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Apr 2, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 2-5, 15, 20, 21, and 24

Identification of prior art discussed:

Lane et al. (1995)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Attorney contacted the Examiner to inquire about the Lane et al. reference that was used in art rejections in the Office Action mailed 3/25/02. The reference is not cited on any of the PTO-892s or the IDSs submitted by Applicant. The Examiner obtained the case and prepared a PTO-892 citing the reference and faxed a copy of the reference and PTO-892 to the Attorney at fax no. (404)572-5145. The Examiner also pointed out that the Office Action Summary is in error where it states that Claims 1-5, 15, 20, 21, and 24 are pending because it should say that Claims 2-5, 15, 20, 21, and 24 are pending. Further, box 4 under "Attachments" should not be checked off, because there is no Interview Summary in this case prior to this one.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

*Anne-Marie Baker*  
**ANNE-MARIE BAKER**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.